10/1/71

Dear Howard (ccSM),

If Sylvia advises you other than I do in answer to your letter of the 29th, I encourage you to take her advice without question, for today is one of the worst for me in many years of bad days. It is now 4 p.m. and I have had to waste the day in nerve-shattering file combing and writing to the publishers of FRAME-UP, whose crookedness is so all-eoncompassing, it refeats fraud after I have warned them I have the proof. Not until yesterday did I even get a copy of the contract, and they had by then signed only one of its two parts. Aside from what they cost us both by not living up to the advertising and promotional agreements, they are beatming me out of considerably more than $4000, and we, quite literally, verge on pennilessness. This is aside from out debts. We can't pay other things now due or overdue.

My opinion is that there is nothing wrong with your conclusion. I suggest you consider ~~frxxxxx~~ for it the non-Garrisonian foreword to O in NO, the note on the commission of German eminences who validated the invasion of Poland. It seems to me to fit and to be appropriate and calculated to infuriate him, something at this point I regard as a public service. You are right to give him no quarter, and it is in this sense that I make this recommendation.

Frankly, I think you have both been too kind to him and haven't begun to belabor him with his own record, which is worse than Sylvia's proper focus on the one thing. But in even his own words,, to say that nobodt saw Oswald between 12: 55 and 12:30 (and even this figure is wrong or exculpatory) is to refer to slight pregnancy.

Your tone should be determined by your desires. If you really want to provoke him ibto further stupidities, use gentlemanly language. If you want to risk his keeping his promise, and I would, give him real hell. He deserves it and has asked for it. You might take the added liberty of reminding him that although he was well paid for ita and got side benefits from it, unless he has undertaken an enormous research at the cost of his law practise, you, without any compensation, have spent thousands of hours more than he in study of this material. Nail once and for all that drek about their knowledge coming from so much work.

That he wrote you an 8-page letter is, I think, at least partial validation of SM's hunch. Speed him to the couch. It is the milk of human kindness to do it. If you can.

For whatever it is worth, remember two things: you have seen my Specter file, and from the time I called him a lair, in writing and to his face and challeneged him, he has mainatined a public silence broken only when you did it for him at Penn; and despite the fact that it was easily my worst performance, when I was past exhaustion and had been booby-trapped by our own Los Angeles "friends", what I did to Liebeler on the Les Crane show has shut his mouth -totally-since and ended his "book". So, vigor with these bastards does accomplish something. At least did. Pretty much the asme is true of Ball.

You might want to consider turning around his business of him grading you. Ask him if he would agree to confront you at Penn, publicly, and let the students grade both of you. Remind him that you are not asking him to let <u>you</u> grade <u>him</u>. And ask him where the hell he gets off considering himself again equippped to be judge and jury.

I have to do things in heat because of all I have undertaken. You now don't, so withhold final judgement for the two weeks you mention. But I'd rub him a little more, as with Mrs. Arnold and Mrs. Rowland.

Re; appreciated enclosed clip, if any require comment, I'll make it later.

Best,